



Memorandum

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: Joseph H. Horwedel
Acting, Director

**SUBJECT: EVERGREEN♦EAST HILLS
VISION STRATEGY (EEHVS)
AND THE PROPOSED UPDATE
TO THE EVERGREEN
DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

DATE: November 1, 2006

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5, 7, & 8
SNI AREA: West Evergreen,
K.O.N.A., &
East Valley/680

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed Evergreen Development Policy Update.

OVERVIEW

This report addresses the proposal to update the Evergreen Development Policy (EDP) to establish new transportation level of service standards that would allow additional residential development beyond existing policy caps. The EDP area is generally bounded by Hellyer Avenue, Highway 101, Story Road, and the City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in the eastern foothills (see Attachment 1).

A community Task Force worked on the elements of the proposed of the EDP update and associated General Plan land use changes through an open planning process called the Evergreen♦East Hills Vision Strategy (EEHVS). In exchange for a lower transportation level of service standards within the EDP area, the proposed Policy update sets forth the phasing and the funding of various transportation projects and community amenities. The developers of "Four Opportunity Sites" have voluntarily agreed to pay for these projects, which are beyond what the City could typically require through standard exactions. The Four Opportunity Sites include

Arcadia (just south of Eastridge shopping center), the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course, a portion of the Evergreen Valley Community College, and vacant lands adjacent to the east foothills known as the “Campus Industrial” site. A Funding Agreement between the City of San Jose and the property owners of the Four Opportunity Sites will be considered by the City Council to document this arrangement.

The Planning Commission is being asked to make recommendations to the City Council on the following land use policy items:

- Proposed Update to the Evergreen Development Policy;
- Amendments to the *San Jose 2020 General Plan* text to incorporate the updated EDP into the General Plan, including the addition of language describing the EEHVS process, modifications to the EDP description, additions to Appendix F: Mixed Use Inventory, and amendments to Appendix E: Major Collector Streets to reduce certain streets from planned four lanes to two lanes, and other related changes (GPT05-08-01); and
- Amendments to the *San Jose 2020 General Plan* Land Use/Transportation Diagram to incorporate land use changes on the Four Opportunity Sites (GP05-08-01A-F).

The full text of the proposed Policy and its appendices are contained in Attachment 5. Detailed analysis regarding the associated General Plan changes are included in separate reports and are to be considered as a package with the proposed EDP update.

The purposes of this report are to:

1. Describe the Evergreen♦East Hills Vision Strategy (EEHVS) planning process
2. Explain the proposed EDP update, and
3. Evaluate the EDP update and the recommendations of its components against the EEHVS Vision and Expected Outcomes and the *San Jose 2020 General Plan*

BACKGROUND

Site and Surrounding Uses

The Evergreen Development Policy (EDP) area is generally bordered by Hellyer Avenue, Highway 101, Story Road, and the City’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in the eastern foothills. The predominant land uses within the EDP area are single-family homes, some commercial and retail development, and approximately 426 acres of industrially designated land. The EDP update contemplates creating new residential development capacity on Four Opportunity Sites located within the EDP area as well as establishing a “pool” of additional units that might be available for future development on other properties located in the EDP area. The Four Opportunity Sites are further described as:

- *Arcadia* – This site is an approximate 81-acre site that is currently vacant and lies south of the Eastridge Mall. The site has frontage along both Quimby Road and Capitol Expressway. The General Plan designates Quimby Road as an Arterial and Capitol Expressway as a Transit-Oriented Development Corridor. The site is also located approximately 2,600 feet south of Reid-Hillview Airport and a 12-acre portion of the site is located within the Airport Approach Zone. Uses permitted in the Airport Approach Zone are regulated by the Airport Land Use Commission and are generally low intensity type uses such as industrial or public park uses.

The existing land uses surrounding the site include: Eastridge Mall across Quimby Road to the north, Meadowfair Park, LeyVa Middle School and a mobile home park to the south; Industrial Park uses to the east; and single-family detached residential to the west. The site is located within a Redevelopment Project Area of the City and within the West Evergreen Strong Neighborhood Initiative area.

The subject site is currently designated with a Mixed Use Overlay that allows for development consistent with the current underlying base designations of Medium Low Density Residential (8 DU/AC) on 34 acres, Office on 10 acres, Public/Quasi-Public on 12 acres, Industrial Park on 23 acres, and Public Park/Open Space on 2 acres.

- *Evergreen Valley Community College* – This site is an approximately 27-acre portion of the greater 165-acre Evergreen Valley College campus, and surrounds the existing commercial development on the northeast corner of Yerba Buena and San Felipe Roads. The San José/Evergreen Community College District offices and a criminal justice training center currently occupy a portion of the 27-acre site. The site has frontage along both Yerba Buena and San Felipe Roads and is directly adjacent to the Evergreen Valley College campus to the east.

The existing land uses and General Plan Designations surrounding the site include: single-family detached residential across Evergreen Creek (Low Density Residential 5.0 DU/AC) to the north; Evergreen Park (Public Park and Open Space) to the south; Evergreen Valley College (Public/Quasi-Public) to the east; and single-family detached and senior residential (Low Density Residential 5.0 DU/AC and Medium High Density Residential 12-25 DU/AC).

- *Pleasant Hills Golf Course* – The subject 112 acre site is the recently closed Pleasant Hills Golf Course located on the northeast corner of South White and Tully Roads. The site has frontage along South White Road, Tully Road and Vista Verde Drive.

The existing land uses surrounding the site include: single-family detached residential to the north; single-family detached residential to the south across Tully Road; single-family detached residential to the east across Vista Verde Drive; and Lake Cunningham Regional Park to the west across South White Road.

- *Campus Industrial* – The subject Campus Industrial site is inclusive of three separate property owners (Berg & Berg Enterprises, IDS, and Legacy) and three separate General Plan Amendments associated with the EEHVS “package.” The three sites are located along the southeast side of the Evergreen Specific Plan (ESP) area, south of Aborn Road and north of Old Yerba Buena Road. The sites front onto Yerba Buena Road and its future extension. The City’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and Urban Service Area (USA) lines bound the easterly property lines of the subject sites.

General Plan designations and uses surrounding the site include: ESP Townhome and Hillside lots on vacant land to the north, vacant Non Urban Hillside to the east and south; and Public Park/Open Space (Fowler Creek Park and Montgomery Hill Park), ESP Single-Family Residential (6,000 square foot lots) and High Density Residential, and Chaboya Middle School to the west.

Existing Evergreen Development Policy

The original EDP was adopted in August 1976 to address the issues of flood protection and traffic capacity in the area south of Story Road and east of Highway 101. The EDP was based on City analyses, which concluded that transportation and flood protection deficiencies constituted substantial constraints to development in Evergreen. The 1976 EDP established the policy framework for dealing with the planned development as identified by the General Plan at that time and identified specific programs for correcting the service deficiencies. Since the adoption of the EDP, growth in the Evergreen area has been limited by the availability of urban services, particularly the capacity of the transportation and flood control systems. In particular, the EDP limited the construction of new residential units in order to achieve a goal of meeting a traffic Level of Service “D” at key boundary (screenline) intersections.

Under the original EDP, the screenline intersections reached their maximum traffic capacity in 1989, effectively preventing additional residential development. At that point, however, there was vacant land that could accommodate almost four thousand new units if flooding and traffic issues could be addressed. Of these potential units, 3,000 were within the future Evergreen Specific Plan (ESP) area.

In 1990, the City Council initiated the *Evergreen Specific Plan* (ESP) to create a unique suburban area with a mix of lot sizes, housing types, retail, parks, schools, and other amenities. The ESP was the catalyst to revise the EDP, and through that effort the City was able to identify additional traffic mitigation to support the construction of the new units. Traffic analysis performed in conjunction with the preparation of the ESP quantified the traffic capacity required to allow full development of the remaining vacant lands in Evergreen and identified potential street improvements that could provide the required capacity to maintain a traffic Level of Service (LOS) “D” at the screenline intersections. In 1991, the City Council approved the ESP and revised the EDP to be consistent with the ESP.

The EDP was again revised in 1995 to provide the policy framework for the additional future development based on the General Plan at that time. The goal of maintaining the basic traffic

LOS “D” and hundred-year flood projection standards of the original 1976 and 1991 Revised EDP was preserved as prerequisites to project approvals. The 1995 Revised EDP identified the remaining watershed and street system improvements required to allow 4,759 dwelling units to proceed. A Benefit Assessment District (No. 91-209SJ Aborn-Murillo) was formed to provide a cost-sharing plan to finance and construct the extensive infrastructure network enhancements necessary to facilitate the planned and potential dwelling units identified by the *San José 2020 General Plan* and the ESP. In 1998 the Benefit Assessment District was augmented and updated through the formation of Community Facilities District No. 4 as a result of changes to the laws governing special districts. The Assessment District remains in effect along with the Community Facilities District (CFD).

A minor modification was made to the EDP Ordinance in August 1998 to refine the traffic analysis methodology in order to facilitate small-scale, non-residential development. Following this modification, transportation methodology was no longer based upon screenline intersections, but based upon the measurement at all affected intersections within the EDP area.

Berryessa/Evergreen Swap

In 1980, the City approved General Plan amendments to exchange land uses between the Evergreen and Berryessa areas. This exchange became known as the Berryessa/Evergreen Swap. Approximately 300 acres in the Berryessa area were converted from Industrial Park uses to residential uses. To complement the industrial-to-residential conversion in Berryessa, approximately 375 acres of land in Evergreen were converted from low density residential to Campus Industrial uses. 320 acres of the original 375 acres are proposed to be converted for residential uses as part of the herein EEHVS process. The “swap” was approved to maintain the City’s overall industrial job base and to bring jobs and housing opportunities closer together to help reduce the impacts of commuting from southern San Jose neighborhoods to job centers in the north. Subsequently the Berryessa housing was fully developed and only one campus industrial project was completed in the Evergreen area.

The Motivations for the Evergreen♦East Hills Vision Strategy Planning Process

Several previous planning efforts and other events contributed to the initiation of the Evergreen♦East Hills Vision Strategy process. In 2001 and 2002 respectively, the City Council adopted the West Evergreen and KONA Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI) Improvement Plans. Based on significant community involvement through the West Evergreen and KONA Neighborhood Advisory Committees (NACs), the Plans identify “top ten” action items to enhance existing and create new community facilities, trails, and other investments.

In November 2002, the Evergreen-Eastridge area was selected by the Knight Program in Community Building for a charrette, engaging the City, various stakeholder groups, the broader community, graduate students, and outside technical experts in an intensive five day planning exercise. The result was a report suggesting options for future land use development, transportation, and community facilities. This report was built upon prior planning efforts such as the two SNI Plans.

Also in 2002, two major Evergreen property owners (Legacy and Evergreen Valley College) applied for General Plan amendments to add housing and retail development. At that time staff identified that any development of new housing would require an update to the Evergreen Development Policy because the current traffic policy would not accommodate housing growth beyond the existing General Plan.

Subsequently, in 2003 several Evergreen area property owners/developers agreed to fund a comprehensive land use and transportation planning effort rather than pursue individual General Plan amendments and modification to the EDP in a piecemeal fashion. The property owners/developers represent the properties know as Arcadia, Pleasant Hills Golf Course, Campus Industrial and Evergreen Valley College (see map contained in Attachment 1). Collectively these properties are referred to as the Four Opportunity Sites. The property owner/developers also offered to finance various transportation investments and community amenities, described further in this report.

The recent planning process began in August 2003 with the formation of a task force composed of neighborhood association leaders, Strong Neighborhood Initiative Neighborhood Advisory Committee representatives, Knight Charrette participants, business and professional representatives, school board members and administrators, and other stakeholders under the leadership of Councilmember David Cortese. The project was initially called the Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy or Evergreen Visioning Project. The original task force adopted a set of Guiding Principles based upon an intent to create a community-based plan that balanced new development (residential and non-residential development in infill locations) with the construction of transportation investments and community amenities. This unique balancing act is intended to improve the overall quality of life in and around Evergreen.

The Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force met at least monthly through June 2005:

- Identifying land use scenarios for evaluation in the Environmental Impact Report;
- Identifying potential community amenities;
- Conducting site visits of affordable housing and mixed use developments;
- Talking to VTA experts about Highway 101 improvements and proposed light rail extensions along Capitol Expressway; and
- Learning about existing traffic conditions and potential traffic effects that would result from different amounts of new development

In June 2005, under City Council direction, the original task force was reconfigured to have broader representation, including developers as well as community representatives (see Attachment 5 Proposed EDP Update, Appendix G for the current Task Force roster). At that time the Council also adopted ten Vision and Expected Outcome statements to guide the planning effort (see Attachment 5 Proposed EDP Update, Appendix A). The Guiding Principles crafted by the original Task Force are incorporated directly into the Vision and Expected Outcomes.

During the preparation of the EEHVS, the reconfigured 30-member Task Force met 16 times from August 2005 through October 2006. The new Task Force worked from the foundation of information and principles from the original Task Force. All of its meetings were public and approximately 30 to 50 people attended in the audience. Of those, usually a handful would address the Task Force with their comments. The planning process was designed to facilitate community consensus around a shared vision for the area.

In addition to the Task Force meetings, community meetings were held in all three affected Council Districts to inform interested people about the EEHVS, obtain their input, and answer questions. Staff also kept the West Evergreen, the East Valley/680, and the K.O.N.A Neighborhood Advisory Committees (NACs) and the local neighborhood associations informed of the state and key elements of the EEHVS. All of this additional community input was summarized and made available to the Task Force. A summary of the community outreach is contained under “Public Outreach” later in this report.

At the last three meetings, the Task Force worked on their recommendations for the elements of the EDP update and listened to public comment regarding growth, traffic, schools, and major supermarkets. Given the broad range of interests, the Task Force did not reach consensus on the key variables contained in the proposed EDP update. Staff promised to bring forward all of the recommendations and their votes so the decision makers could appreciate the hard work, thoughtfulness, and difficulty associated with finding a perfect delicate balance of growth and amenities. The recommendations are described in the below section under “Analysis.” All land use and amenity recommendations by the Task Force are also attached for reference and consideration (see Attachments 3 and 4).

ANALYSIS

The key issues associated with the proposed EDP update are presented in the following sections: 1) Summary of Task Force recommendations, 2) EDP update proposal, 3) consistency with the City Council adopted EEHVS Vision and Expected Outcomes, 4) consistency with the *San José 2020 General Plan* Major Strategies, Goals, and Policies and 5) consistency with the Council-adopted *Framework, as a Guideline, for Evaluating Proposed Conversion of Employment Lands to Other Uses*. This analysis addresses the substantive issues raised by the EEHVS Task Force, community residents, and property owners.

1) Summary of Task Force Recommendations

As describe above, the EEHVS process focused on opportunities for new housing growth balanced with transportation investments and community amenities. The Policy mechanism for the referenced balance is a proposed update to the EDP. The *San Jose 2020 General Plan* sets forth a general traffic level of service (LOS) policy that establishes a minimum overall performance standard for City streets during peak travel periods. However, the General Plan provides for the adoption of an Area Development Policy to allow exceptions from the citywide

LOS standards for a specific geographic area, should the Council deem it necessary in order to achieve a particular vision of future growth for sub-areas such as Evergreen. The EEHVS process considers an update the existing EDP to allow new LOS standards in order to achieve a vision for the Evergreen area that would allow some amount of new residential units. The Task Force debated various land use combinations (see Appendix 3 for all of the land use recommendations). Two land use recommendations received more votes than others and are described below:

- **Developer Proposed Development Alternative**

Representatives of the property owner group are proposing that a total of 5,200 new residential units be allocated to the four Opportunity Sites with a background “pool” allocation of 500 units for non-opportunity sites. The property owners maintain that this amount of new development is necessary to deliver the package of transportation and amenity projects tentatively identified during the original Evergreen Visioning Project and they expressed uncertainty of the viability of any proposal with fewer units. Specific unit allocation under the developers’ proposal is identified in the following table. In addition to the 4 developer representatives on the Task Force, one other Task Force member supported this alternative.

PROJECT SITE	Residential Units (up to)	Commercial/Office Square Footage (up to)
Arcadia	1,875	150,000
Pleasant Hills Golf Course	825	0
Evergreen Valley College	500	195,000
Campus Industrial (IDS/Legacy/Berg)	2,000	0
“Pool” Units	500	N/A
Total	5,700 units	345,000 SQFT

- **Primary Task Force Proposed Alternative**

The primary Task Force recommendation considered that the following development capacities could provide enough developer revenue to pay for the transportation investments and amenities proposed as part of the EEHVS “package.” This recommendation was the result of a vote of 13 yes votes, 9 no votes, and 1 abstention, with 7 Task Force members absent. Four of the “no” votes submitted alternative recommendations (see Appendix 3).

PROJECT SITE	Residential Units (up to)	Commercial/Office Square Footage (up to)
Arcadia	1,800	100,000
Pleasant Hills Golf Course	600	50,000
Evergreen Valley College	300	100,000
Campus Industrial (IDS/Legacy/Berg)	900	0
“Pool” Units	400	Unlimited
Total	4,000 units	300,000 SQFT

Note: This alternative recommends the preservation of 120 acres of industrially designated land on the Campus Industrial Site.

- **Staff Alternative Recommendation**

Staff had made suggestions to the Task Force on the land use alternatives but did not put forward a recommendation for their consideration. Based on the Task Force discussions and additional analysis discussed in this report and in the individual General Plan staff reports, Planning staff is now recommending the following development capacities for the Four Opportunity Site and the background/“pool” units.

PROJECT SITE	Residential Units (up to)	Commercial/Office Square Footage (up to)
Arcadia	1,875	300,000
Pleasant Hills Golf Course*	650	30,000
Evergreen Valley College	500	195,000
Campus Industrial (IDS/Legacy/Berg)*	1,275	0
“Pool” Units/SQFT	500	70,000
Total	4,800 units	595,000 SQFT

Note: *This alternative recommends: (1) maintaining 40% open space on the Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site, (2) the preservation of 120 acres of industrially designated land on the Campus Industrial Site, and 3) 500 trip pool is also reserved for other non-residential uses.

Additional, all minority recommendations by the Task Force are attached to this report for reference and consideration (Attachment 3). The minority recommendation alternatives range in development capacities from no development on the Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site and the Campus Industrial Site to permitting a total of approximately 3,600 to 4,800 residential units and a range of commercial/office space from 250,000 square feet to 495,000 square feet.

2) Description of the proposed EDP Update and Phasing

As stated throughout this report the proposed EDP update would allow substantial new development in the EDP area beyond what the current EDP allows. The actual development

capacities would be set by the City Council in consideration of the Task Force, staff, and Planning Commission recommendations as well as public testimony. The proposed EDP update would require significant transportation investments listed later in this report as a condition of development entitlements and building permits. A phasing plan is incorporated into the proposed EDP update which identifies when specific transportation investment triggers or other contractual commitments are required prior to the release of building permits for a certain percentage of residential units on the Four Opportunity Sites.

In addition to the phasing plan and the amenity “package”, staff has incorporated other land dedication requirements into the EDP update to reflect the need to relocate Fire Station #21 to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site and the need for a 2-acre site on the Evergreen Valley College Site for a new library. Dedication of an approximately 1 acre portion of the Golf Course Site for the relocation of a fire station would be required as part of a future Tentative and Final Map for that site. Dedication of the 2-acre portion of the Evergreen Valley College Site would also be required as identified in the Funding Agreement that will be the mechanism that commits the developers to the amenity “package.”

New “Pool” Allocations: The proposed EDP update also identifies a “pool” of additional housing units that would be available to other sites in the EDP area. The Policy proposes criteria which would need to be satisfied before allocations could be distributed as part of the entitlement for a given property. The Policy update also proposes a Traffic Impact Fee so that properties receiving allocations pay a “fair share” (based on nexus requirements) toward the required transportation investments.

New “Protected Intersection”: City Council Policy 5-3: Transportation Impact Policy identifies intersections that may degrade below traffic LOS D without requiring widening or other physical improvements to facilitate automobile travel which would impact the viability of other modes (walking, bicycling, or transit use). Traffic analysis conducted for the proposed Evergreen Development Policy update identified a significant impact to the intersection of Capitol Avenue/Capitol Expressway. As part of the approvals associated with the EDP update, Capitol Avenue/Capitol Expressway would need to be added as a new “protected intersection.”

3) Consistency with the City Council Adopted EEHVS Vision and Expected Outcomes

The City Council adopted Vision and Expected Outcomes (see Attachment 5 Proposed EDP Update, Appendix A) that focus on:

- ✓ Land use compatibility and environmental sustainability
- ✓ A mix of housing options
- ✓ Economic development
- ✓ A balance of new development with transportation and community amenities
- ✓ Financial feasibility
- ✓ Schools
- ✓ Supply of Residential Allocations

Each of the three primary recommendations (Developer, Primary Task Force, and staff) is evaluated against these outcomes.

Land Use Compatibility and Environmental Sustainability. Two Vision and Expected Outcome Statements address land use and environmental sustainability. The proposed update to the EDP includes specific Design Guidelines (see Attachment 5 Proposed EDP Update, Appendices B and C). The guidelines are intended to ensure development is compatible (not necessarily identical) with the existing neighborhoods and to minimize potential impacts on sensitive environmental resources. The guidelines apply smart growth and green building principles to a suburban context. All development approved as part of the proposed update to the EDP would be subject to these proposed guidelines as well as existing City policies including: the Riparian Corridor Policy; the Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Design Guidelines; the Post-Construction Urban Runoff Policy; the Outdoor Lighting Policy; and others. Therefore, adoption of the proposed update to the EDP with any of the proposed recommendation packages would meet this outcome.

A Mix of Housing Options. Two Vision and Expected Outcome Statements address housing options in terms of a mix of ownership and rental, and affordability, respectively. The various recommendation alternatives described above would provide a variety of housing types, including single-family detached units on large and small lots, single-family attached residential units (townhomes), and multi-family units (primarily on the Arcadia and the Evergreen Valley College Site). All of the recommendations could provide a mix of rental and ownership housing.

The recommendation packages vary on the amount and type of affordable housing on the Four Opportunity Sites and the residential “pool” units. Affordable housing is a key topic that was considered through the EEHVS Task Force process. The Arcadia site is the only Opportunity Site located in a Redevelopment Project Area and is required by existing State law and City policy to develop 20% of all new residential units as affordable, deed-restricted units. This baseline requirement is assumed with all of the recommendation alternatives.

Developer Recommendation. Representatives from the Evergreen Valley College Site have stated that they intend to incorporate up to 40% of the units as moderate-income housing. Representatives for the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site and the Campus Industrial Sites are not proposing to develop any affordable units as part of their proposal.

Primary Task Force Recommendation. The Primary Task Force Recommendation would require affordable housing on the Campus Industrial and Pleasant Hills Golf Course sites. The Task Force recommendation would require 19% affordable housing units across all Four Opportunity Sites. The proposal also includes a requirement that any additional development project of 10 units or more that use the background “pool” unit allocation provide a minimum of 15% or 2 units (whichever is greater) of deed restricted affordable units.

Staff Recommendation. Staff introduced the EEHVS effort to the City’s Housing Advisory Commission (HAC) at their August and October meetings. The HAC

recommended that a 20% affordability requirement be stipulated on the total number of units constructed on each of the Four Opportunity Sites and ensure that those units be distributed to serve 30% Extremely Low Income (ELI) households, 30% Very Low Income (VLI) households, and 40% for Low Income (LI) households. Additionally, the HAC recommended that the background/"pool" units be subject to an in-lieu fee determined suitable by staff. In this way, all new housing developments in the Evergreen♦East Hills area would contribute to the City's affordable housing goals.

Although the HAC's recommendation would be a viable alternative, the implementation of the plan would potentially have an impact on the amount of money the developers/property owners could contribute toward the construction of the amenities prioritized by the community and the Task Force. Based on information currently available, staff is recommending:

- Require 20% of the units on the Arcadia site to be constructed as affordable units consistent with the States Redevelopment Law.
- Require 40% of the units on the Evergreen Valley Community College site to be constructed as affordable units.
- Require that the affordable units on the Arcadia and the Evergreen Valley College sites be distributed to provide 12% of the units to meet the City's definition of moderate and low income households and 8% of the units to meet very low income households.

Staff is additionally continuing to evaluate a possible in-lieu fee contribution for the Pleasant Hills Golf Course and the Campus Industrial Sites as well as the "pool" unit sites. This exploration should not impede the Planning Commission from making its recommendations.

Economic Development. Two Vision and Expected Outcome Statements address economic development in terms of employment lands and retail, respectively. The existing 320 acres designated, as Campus Industrial is currently entitled to develop up to 4.66 million square feet of industrial uses, potentially yielding over 10,000 jobs. The Developer Recommendation would convert all of the 320 acres to housing. Both the staff and Primary Task Force recommendations would retain a total of 120 acres of the Campus Industrial designated land, potentially yielding a total of approximately 3,800 high to medium skilled jobs with development at an average density of 0.40 FAR. These jobs would be in addition to the existing 36-acre Hitachi industrial/R&D facility already located in this area. The retention of some amount of Campus Industrial land is important to secure the long term viability of the Hitachi site with other lands to create a "critical mass" of employment lands.

Outcome Statement #6 states that the City should explore opportunities to increase workplace density on existing employment land to create mixed-use opportunities. As stated above, the existing General Plan would allow development on the Campus Industrial designated lands up to a 0.40 FAR. Increasing intensity above the current 0.40 FAR on the proposed 120 acres of

retained employment land would not be consistent with other Goals and Policies in the *San Jose 2020 General Plan* which strive to preserve the views of the eastern foothills and promote less intense uses at the edges of the City. Therefore, staff concludes that the retention of the 120 acres of Campus Industrial land with the current intensity maximum of 0.40 FAR is appropriate at this location.

Outcome Statement #7 encourages capturing new retail and commercial opportunities while strengthening all existing retail, including the commercial center at the Evergreen Village. The various recommendations described in this report also discuss the appropriate amount and location of new retail development within the EEHVS area. The recommended alternatives range between 200,000 square feet and 500,000 square feet of new retail capacity. As proposed by the property owner group, two of the Opportunity Sites would include retail or commercial/office development. Specifically, the Developers are recommending up to 100,000 square feet of retail on the Arcadia Site and 195,000 square feet of retail and commercial/office space on the Evergreen Valley College Site.

City staff and consultants have concluded that local-serving retail and professional office development (e.g., medical and dental practitioners) within the greater Evergreen area would help reduce overall traffic levels by reducing the need to travel longer distances to make use of commercial services. An analysis of retail demand conducted by a consultant to the City found sufficient demand to support up to 500,000 square feet of new retail/office development and identified specific types of retail needed, such as “white table cloth” restaurants. This supports the anecdotal experience of several Task Force members who have commented on the lack of local restaurants and the weekend traffic associated with Evergreen residents traveling to other locations (e.g., Willow Glen or Oakridge) because of a lack of similar venues locally. The Task Force has also discussed how developing the full 500,000 square feet of retail would provide sales tax revenue and partially offset job loss from the proposed employment land conversion. City staff’s recommendation differs from the Developer’s Recommendation (150,000 square feet) and the Primary Task Force Recommended Alternative (100,000 square feet).

Due to the size of the Arcadia Site (81 acres) and its proximity to the existing Eastridge Shopping Center, a VTA transit center and the planned light rail extension, staff is recommending that the Arcadia site be considered for up to 300,000 square feet of retail/professional office, to complement the existing retail opportunities and infrastructure. As referenced above, staff is also recommending the developer’s proposed 195,000 square feet of commercial/office space on the Evergreen Valley College Site and an optional 50,000 square feet of commercial/office space on the Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site.

The West Evergreen community is vocally opposed to the 300,000 square feet of commercial because of traffic through their neighborhood. Staff recommends traffic calming and/or other measures to address this issue.

To meet the Outcome Statement’s provision of “strengthening all existing retail including the commercial center at the Evergreen Village,” staff is recommending a prohibition on the location

of a supermarket greater than 50,000 square feet on the Evergreen Valley Community College site. The College site has proven its retail vigor with its existing tenant mix. Given its prime location at San Felipe and Yerba Buena Roads, this site is expected to be able to continue to attract additional tenants should the Council approve the proposed land use change. The Developers Recommendation disagrees with this position, while the Primary Task Force recommendation is similar to staff's recommendation.

Balance development with transportation and community amenities. The proposed update to the EDP would be consistent with this Outcome in that a variety of transportation projects and community amenities are being proposed as part of the EEHVS to attempt to offset, but not necessarily mitigate, all of the traffic congestion from the proposed developments. All of the proposed recommendations would achieve this Outcome. These transportation projects and community amenities are summarized below.

- **Transportation.** The construction of new transportation infrastructure projects concurrent with the construction of new development within the EDP area is a key element of the proposed EDP update. These transportation projects are divided into four categories: Project Transportation Improvements, Transportation Mitigation Measures, Transportation Amenities and Site Operational Improvements. These investments would be implemented through provisions set forth in the proposed EDP. The Project Transportation Improvements and Transportation Mitigation Measures are also referred to collectively as the "Base Improvements."

The Base Improvements were incorporated into the traffic analysis and environmental review that form the basis of the Transportation Policy and Standards set forth in the EDP. Although the Transportation Mitigation Measure Improvements are required, the Project Transportation investments are voluntarily proposed to be funded by the developers of the Four Opportunity Sites. These improvements are beyond the scope of typical development-funded transportation mitigation programs. Consequently, their implementation is a foundational element for any utilization of the Policy's development capacity, and their funding must occur concurrently with the development of the Four Opportunity Sites. The full funding for these improvements will be secured through the associated Funding Agreement. A detailed explanation of these investments is included as Appendix E to the proposed EDP update (see Attachment 5). The specific base improvements include:

- Operational improvements on Highway 101 between 280/680 and Yerba Buena Road;
- White Road improvements from Ocala Avenue to Quimby Road and from Stevens Lane to Aborn Road;
- The reconfiguration of Ocala Avenue between Capitol Expressway and White Road;
- Intersection and signal improvements along Capitol Expressway between Quimby Road and Highway 101; and

- Various intersection improvements and new traffic signals on other local streets.

These transportation base improvements are non-negotiable and are required with any level of development in the EDP area. An estimate cost of the transportation base improvements for design and construction totals approximately \$117 Million dollars based on 2006 values. Final cost estimates will be determined at the time specific improvements are designed per the EDP phasing plan. These transportation base improvements are described in more detail in attachment F to the EDP.

New residential development occurring outside of the Four Opportunity Sites (background/"pool" units) would be subject to a Traffic Impact Fee to help fund the construction of the transportation mitigation requirements that are required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and therefore, have a clear nexus. Staff has prepared a nexus study to identify the potential contribution from the "pool" units. The results of the study anticipate that \$2 million to \$5 million dollars would be available and is considered additional funding on top of the \$117 million previously mentioned that would be contributed by the property owners/developers.

Some additional transportation investments are considered "amenities" because they are "discretionary" and not required for CEQA purposes, but would provide a benefit to traffic flow, pedestrian safety or other conditions. These include: a proposed Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Network, construction of sections of the Thompson Creek Trail, new bike lanes, transit system enhancements and traffic calming measures. Selected investments in this category are listed with the other community amenities described below and would be funded according to the final amenity prioritization approved by the City Council, the EDP phasing plan, and the availability of funding.

- **Community Amenities.** The second key element of the proposed EDP is the construction of amenities identified by the community to "offset" new development and enhance quality of life in the EDP area. The Task Force process for the EEHVS resulted in multiple recommendations on the priority order of the individual amenities (see Attachment 4). The amenities include new parks and recreational facilities of general benefit to the local community. The funding for these amenities would be linked to the entitlement of new development on the Four Opportunity Sites as outlined in the proposed EDP phasing plan (see Attachment 5).

The construction of the community amenities would occur over time as private development projects are approved and built. While preliminary cost estimates have been prepared for most of the amenities, projected construction costs would have to be refined once design work is completed and ultimately determined at time of construction. The community would be invited to participate in the determination of the specific planning/programming of amenity facilities prior to construction. Because the preliminary cost estimate for the greater amenity list exceeds the anticipated funding

available, it is expected that only a portion of the greater amenity list can be fully funded through the implementation of the proposed Policy update.

The timing and availability of funding would be determined with the issuance of entitlements/building permits for the Four Opportunity Sites. Some amenities are located on specific Opportunity Sites and their full construction may be difficult or impractical ahead of the development of the site. The specific timing for the construction of the amenities is designed to be flexible to allow for practical application of the EDP. It is estimated that a total of \$138 million is necessary to construct the described amenities.

Based on the Task Force and community input, the San Jose Greenprint, and other City considerations, staff has identified the following high priority items:

- ✓ Youth sports fields for Evergreen Little League;
- ✓ Community center on the Arcadia site;
- ✓ Additional sports fields (Arcadia & Mt. Pleasant area);
- ✓ New traffic signals and other major intersection/roadway investments;
- ✓ New Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) network;
- ✓ Thompson Creek trail;
- ✓ Traffic calming investments;
- ✓ South East Branch Library; and
- ✓ Lake Cunningham Park improvements (skate park & other facility improvements)

The larger list of amenities would remain part of the proposed Policy update in the event that funding is available.

Financial Feasibility. Planning staff fully acknowledges the unique planning opportunity presented in the EEHVS and the update to the EDP based on the unusual offer of the developers to pay for Highway 101 investments and community amenities. All stakeholders have been working to find the appropriate balance of new housing with the private financing of the transportation investments and community amenities.

The developers have stated that fewer than 5,200 units on the Four Opportunity Sites would have a substantial impact on their ability to fully fund the transportation investments and the amenities identified through the Task Force process. Some Task Force and community members disagree with this statement. Staff is currently examining the financial feasibility question.

Schools. The project area encompasses three school districts that include the Mount Pleasant School District, the Evergreen Elementary School District, and the East Side Union High School District. According to the EEHVS vision and expected outcomes, schools are considered a basic need and not an amenity. For this reason, a clear resolution of school needs and a commitment of land to meet these needs is a key requirement for many Task Force and community members.

The proposed update to the EDP would be consistent with the Vision and Expected Outcomes due the fact that the Policy proposes a requirement for the property owner group to accommodate

construction of two new K-6 schools and one K-8 school on three of the Four Opportunity Sites. The property owner group and their consultants are engaged in ongoing discussions with the school districts regarding the most suitable size and location of these schools.

In 1998, the passage of Senate Bill 50 prohibited local agencies from denying land use approvals on the basis that school facilities are inadequate. Currently under State law, school districts are authorized to levy development fees intended to cover the costs of school construction; however, there are limitations on the total amount of fees that can be levied. School fees are subject to meeting a nexus requirement between the fee and the impact created by the new development. In addition, the reinstatement of the school facility fee cap for legislative actions (i.e., general plan amendments, specific plan adoption, and rezonings) provide local agencies the legal authority, under the California Environmental Quality Act, to require new development to mitigate school impacts fully.

A significant number of community and Task Force members are also very interested in identifying a site for a new high school in the southeast Evergreen area. There are concerns about existing overcrowding in the local high schools. The East Side Union High School District Board is considering possible attendance boundary adjustments to improve student distribution and relieve overcrowding. The Eastside Union High School District School (ESUHSD) Board has also issued a memorandum identifying a long-term need for a new high school in the southeast portion of their district.

As a result, the Primary Task Force Recommendation proposes that the Campus Industrial Opportunity Site reserve 50 acres for a possible new high school location. The property owner group has indicated that providing 40 to 50 acres necessary for a high school on any of the Opportunity Sites would be a significant obstacle to achieving the transportation investments and amenities package.

Staff is not recommending the reservation of a specific site for a high school; however, staff is adamantly opposed to a new high school locating in the Edenvale Redevelopment Area. Ultimately, the decision to pursue a new high school site is the responsibility of the ESUHD governing board and the City welcomes the opportunity to discuss site options with the District should they decide to pursue a new high school.

Supply of Residential Allocations. One of the EEHVS Outcomes requires the proposed Policy update to create a ten year supply of residential allocations. Based on an analysis of vacant and underutilized land in the EDP area, staff believes that approximately 500 units should be sufficient. This is the number identified in the Developer and Staff Recommendations. The Primary Task Force Recommendation identified 400 units. In effect, all recommendations satisfy this Outcome.

4) Consistency with the *San José 2020 General Plan Major Strategies, Goals, and Policies*

The City of San Jose 2020 General Plan contains seven Major Strategies:

- Growth Management
- Economic Development
- Downtown Revitalization
- Urban Conservation/Preservation
- The Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary
- Housing
- Sustainable City

The City Council adopted Vision and Expected Outcome Statements capture six of the seven Major Strategies relevant to the EEHVS effort (Downtown Revitalization is not directly affected). Given the earlier assessment of the alternatives against the Vision and Expected Outcomes, this section only emphasizes two Major Strategies: Growth Management and Economic Development.

Growth Management Major Strategy. The Growth Management Major Strategy includes policies that guide new development to infill locations to make efficient use of existing infrastructure, minimizing the impact on services provided by the City. This Strategy incorporates the City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), the ultimate limit of urban development. The Strategy also states that new development is expected to pay for the infrastructure required to support it.

The proposed update to allow additional residential development in the EDP area would be consistent with this Strategy in that it provides for a mix of residential units and commercial development within an already developed portion of the City. New development of the Four Opportunity Sites would place new development in proximity to existing and planned infrastructure including U.S. Highway 101 and the planned Capitol Expressway light rail expansion.

For many people, traffic congestion is an indicator of quality of life. The proposed EDP update acknowledges an increase in congestion associated with the proposed levels of development. Although the proposed update of the EDP would include a "package" of transportation investments, significant project related traffic increases would occur with the development of the EEHVS. Specifically, the proposed alternative recommendations would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at 6 or 8 area intersections (depending on the specific land use recommendation) and up to 15 freeway segments along U.S. 101, I-280 and I-680. One development alternative that the Final EIR did identify that would not increase traffic congestion beyond the existing condition is the alternative that would only permit a total of 600 units.

Although new development may be appropriate for this area of the City, for the above reasons, the primary question is "What amount of new development is acceptable?" The total number of new residential units has been perhaps the most contentious topic with which the Task Force has grappled due to the traffic implications. Many community members and Task Force members have stated that they would prefer to see no development occur at all, while others have stated that they recognize the potential to develop and want to ensure additional development is

balanced with “quality of life” improvements that are to be provided as part of the EEHVS “package.”

Economic Development Major Strategy. The Economic Development Major Strategy involves providing land for a diverse economic base, including office, research and development, professional offices (e.g., medical), and retail. Economic diversity provides jobs at various skill and wage levels. This report already discussed the possibility of intensifying the employment lands and retail potential of the EEHVS. This section identifies the citywide perspective on the potential conversion of 320 acres of Campus Industrial land.

In recent years, the City has acknowledged the structural changes that have occurred in the San Jose economy, as documented in the adopted *Economic Development Strategy*. The *Strategy* identifies the critical role of Driving, Business Support and People-Serving Industries to the overall health of the economy. Different industries have different land requirements, and San Jose is fortunate to have choices available for the full spectrum of industries interested in staying or relocating to San Jose.

Driving and Business Support Industries are especially important, and today, locations exist for them in Downtown, North San Jose, Edenvale, Coyote Valley, or Evergreen. The City Council has recently adopted policies to expand the development capacity in Downtown and North San Jose for companies looking for a more urban location. Downtown is distinguished by its cultural offerings. Edenvale is home to the City’s Bioscience Incubator and has location opportunities for new technology companies.

North Coyote Valley and Evergreen have been planned since the 1980s as the premier location for campus-style, “greenfield” development. Neither area has achieved their potential for a variety of reasons. The Coyote Valley is now in its own planning process, considering designating housing in close proximity to jobs and transit in an environmentally sensitive manner. The proposed Coyote Valley Specific Plan would retain the longstanding development potential of 50,000 jobs.

Brokers and others in the development community argue that Evergreen will remain the last location of choice compared with Downtown, North San Jose, Edenvale, and Coyote Valley. All of these areas have more proximate and visible freeway access than Evergreen. It is interesting to note, however, that the Legacy property was about to break ground for new offices when the recent recession started. Given the peaks and valleys of economic cycles, the Evergreen Campus Industrial lands may be attractive again to future businesses. For this reason, staff recommends retaining a 120-acre portion for the long term future.

As part of the package of proposals associated with the EDP update, staff is recommending a General Plan text change to reinforce the importance of the Edenvale employment lands. If all or the majority of the Evergreen employment lands are converted, Edenvale becomes even more critical for the future of San Jose’s economy.

5) Framework, as a Guideline, for Evaluating Proposed Conversion of Employment Lands to Other Uses

One of the critical questions with converting the Campus Industrial land within the EDP area is its consistency with the City Council adopted “*Framework, as a Guideline, to Evaluate Proposed Conversions of Employment Lands to Other Uses.*” The Framework states that the Campus Industrial designations in the Evergreen sub-area should only be considered for conversion if recommended through the Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy process, now referred to as the EEHVS. The recommendations described above propose a variety of options including the elimination of all 320 acres of industrially designated land to the preservation of 120 acres. Although these recommendations are a result of the EEHVS Task Force process, any conversion should also be reviewed in consistency with the *San Jose 2020 General Plan* Major Strategies, Goals, and Policies as discussed above and in the associated General Plan Amendment staff reports.

FISCAL ANALYSIS/IMPLICATIONS

As stated throughout this report, the proposed update to the EDP would include significant new infrastructure in the way of transportation investments (new traffic signals, traffic calming facilities, intersection improvements, etc.) in addition to new park and community facilities (new neighborhood parks, regional sports facilities, and community centers). Although the property owners/developers are proposing to fund construction of these new facilities and in some cases to “turnkey” the development of these new facilities, the ongoing operations and maintenance (O&M) of the new facilities is an issue that City staff is currently evaluating.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION ALTERNATIVES

Recommendation Alternative #1: Do not update the Evergreen Development Policy and defer the consideration of additional housing development opportunities in the EDP area to the comprehensive General Plan Update.

Pros: The EEHVS brought forward a variety of issues that would be considered typically as part of a General Plan Update, including: funding new infrastructure, operating and maintenance, and how to balance new residential development with job growth as well as other community needs such as places of worship/assembly. The General Plan update would be the appropriate forum to study growth issues in Evergreen within a citywide context of fiscal impacts, economic forecasts, etc. Additionally, the City would be able to complete a citywide sports facility study and Greenprint update to determine future land requirements for parks and recreation. Once land is developed, particularly for housing, the opportunity to consider other options is eliminated.

Cons: If the proposed EDP update is deferred to the General Plan update, the developers and some members of the community would perceive the EEHVS process as a waste of time and money. The developers funded the EEHVS planning effort, however, their

funding only “bought” the completion of a process and not a particular outcome. If the EDP update is postponed, the developers would likely not offer to pay for transportation investments and community amenities beyond typical nexus requirements. Transportation investments would occur through public funding. Community amenities would be implemented at some point; however, the timing and funding of the identified amenities would be unknown.

Recommendation Alternative #2: Update the Evergreen Development Policy with the Developer’s Recommendation of up to 5,200 residential units on Four Opportunity Sites, up to 345,000 square feet of commercial/ professional office uses, and up to 500 background/”pool” units to be developed on sites other than the Four Opportunity Sites.

Pros: The developers would pay for significant transportation investments and other community amenities that the City could not typically require from standard nexus and development exactions. Although these community investments and facilities may be built without the project, the proposed “package” would bring the subject investments online sooner.

Cons: The trade-off for allowing additional development in the EDP area is: (1) the increase in traffic congestion on the local roadways and gateways; and (2) the loss of a significant amount (320 acres) of employment lands and its associated long term tax base.

Recommendation Alternative #3: Update the Evergreen Development Policy with the Primary Task Force Recommendation for up to 3,600 residential units, up to 300,000 square feet of commercial/professional office uses, and up to 400 background/”pool” units.

Pros: The Primary Task Force alternative proposes to retain up to 120 acres of the Campus Industrial designated land and thereby preserving potential for future jobs in the Evergreen area and its associated benefits. Additionally, the Primary Task Force alternative recommends incorporating affordable housing on all of the Four Opportunity Sites (19% overall) in addition to the proposed background/”pool” units.

Cons: The Task Force recommendation to reserve land for a new high school could potentially preclude the development of future industrial uses and/or the development of units needed to generate sufficient funds by the developers to fund the EEHVS “package” referenced in this report.

Recommendation Alternative #4: Update the Evergreen Development Policy with the Staff Recommendation for an additional 4,800 residential units, up to 595,000 square feet of retail commercial/office space, and 500 “pool” units (see Attachment 2, Staff Recommendation).

Pros: Staff’s recommendation alternative would provide an opportunity for office and research and development jobs in the retained 120 acre Industrial Campus area; opportunity for future recreation and open space on the 40% open space area on the

Pleasant Hills Golf Course site; provide new affordable housing opportunities in an area of the City which has not historically met the demand for such housing.

Cons: The developers have stated that the retention of approximately 120 acres of Campus Industrial designated land would preclude them from funding the previously referenced transportation investments and community amenity “package.”

PUBLIC OUTREACH

- ☐ **Criteria 1:** Requires Council action on the use of public funds equal to \$1 million or greater. **(Required: Website Posting)**
- ☐ **Criteria 2:** Adoption of a new or revised policy that may have implications for public health, safety, quality of life, or financial/economic vitality of the City. **(Required: E-mail and Website Posting)**
- ✓ **Criteria 3:** Consideration of proposed changes to service delivery, programs, staffing that may have impacts to community services and have been identified by staff, Council or a Community group that requires special outreach. **(Required: E-mail, Website Posting, Community Meetings, Notice in appropriate newspapers)**

As described in the memorandum, the Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy process involved extensive community outreach through open community Task Force meetings, community meetings and ultimately hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council. This project goes beyond the requirements of Council Policy 6-30: Public Outreach for Pending Land Use and Development Proposals.

Since August 2005 staff has participated in 34 meetings (not including the 16 Task Force meetings) to take comments and questions from the public and to provide information on the status and key elements of the EEHVS. The 34 meetings included: 13 SNI/NAC meetings, 6 neighborhood meetings, 3 general community meetings, 2 workshops, 2 school board meetings, 2 EIR meetings, 4 City Commission meetings, 1 City Council study session, and 2 District 8 Community Events. The number of attendees at these meetings varied from 5 at the EIR public scoping meeting to 85 at the first general community meeting.

The majority of comments and concerns expressed opposition to any new housing and associated traffic in an area that has recently experienced significant new residential development. Other concerns included the loss of open space, compatibility of proposed developments with existing neighborhoods, the effect of a new full service supermarket at the Evergreen Valley College site on existing grocery stores, and the effect of new development on existing schools.

In addition to community outreach meetings, staff has maintained a growing e-mail distribution list of individuals interested in receiving regular updates on the EEHVS process. Presently, the distribution list includes approximately 370 contacts.

The EEHVS website is a continuously updated resource for finding information about the process including announcements, Task Force meeting information, reference materials, the outreach calendar, public comments and specific topics like schools, retail, the draft Evergreen Development Policy, and the EIR process.

Attachment 6 to this report contains letters organized by the topics of retail, schools, and general correspondence.

COORDINATION

The preparation of the proposed EDP update was coordinated with the City Manager's Office, the City Attorney's Office, and various Departments and Agencies, including the Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services; Transportation; Public Works; Housing; Fire; Police; Redevelopment Agency; and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. This coordination included the preparation of this report as well as participation in the community Task Force process.

CEQA

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR), entitled *Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy*, was prepared for the proposed Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy and provides both program level and project level environmental review appropriate to address and evaluate the environmental impacts of the project appropriate for the adoption of the proposed update to the Evergreen Development Policy, General Plan amendments, funding agreement, and subsequent Planned Development (PD) rezonings. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment from February 3, 2006 to March 20, 2006.

PLANNING COMMISSION

November 1, 2006

**Subject: Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy/
Proposed Evergreen Development Policy Update**
Page 24

The DEIR analyzed the project and its environmental setting, identified potentially significant environmental impacts, and proposed mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels where possible. The conclusions of the Final EIR are contained in a separate report.


JOSEPH HORWEDEL, ACTING DIRECTOR
Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

For questions please contact Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director, at (408) 535-7901.

Attachment(s):

1. EEHVS/EDP Boundary Map
2. Staff Recommendation Table
3. Task Force Alternative Proposals (A-F)
4. Task Force Amenity Proposals (G-L)
5. Draft Evergreen Development Policy Update
 - a. Vision and Expected Outcomes
 - b. Design Guidelines
 - c. Green Building Measures
 - d. TDM Measures
 - e. Transportation Investments
 - f. Amenity Descriptions
 - g. Task Force Members
 - h. Existing Unit Allocation Table
6. Comment Letters by Topic:
 - ✓ Retail
 - ✓ Schools
 - ✓ General Correspondence